UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/698,441	11/03/2003	Se Kit Yuen	Q77986	1528
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 04/10/200 ON. PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.			CONLEY, SEAN EVERETT	
SUITE 800 WASHINGTOI	N, DC 20037		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/698,441	YUEN, SE KIT		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SEAN E. CONLEY	1797	í	

	OLINI E. GONEET	'' ''	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>25 March 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 (periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidaviteal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>5</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing data	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed was a part of the property of the pr	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in betom 	nsideration and/or search (see NOTow);	TE below);	
appeal; and/or	ter form for appear by materially rec	adding of Simplifying th	10 133403 101
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		(, .
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	lowable if submitted in a separate, t	-	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is profile that soft he claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 3-5, 7 and 9-11. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an ex	planation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good anwas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/William H. Beisner/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1797	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: All of the applicant's arguments are not pursuasive. First, regarding the 112, 1st paragraph rejection, the applicant argues that the limitation "for forcing the air from the air inlet once around the ultraviolet band C radiation tube" is clearly supported by Fig. 3 and within the text of pages 5 and 7 of the specification. This argument is pursuasive and therefore this rejection is withdrawn. The applicant's arguments directed to the rejection fo claims 3-5, 7 and 9-11 under 35 USC 103(a) have been considered but they are not pursusuasive. Regarding claim 9, the claimed limitation of "for forcing the air from the air inlet once around the ultraviolet band C radiation tube" is fully met by the combination of the prior art references cited in the final rejection. The applicant specifically points to the disclosure of Palestro that states that the air circulates around the ultraviolet tubes twice and the applicant thus argues that Palestro does not teach one pass around the tube. The examiner disagrees. Claim 9 only requires that prior art teach or suggest that the air is forced once around the ultraviolet tube. The claim language is not limited to only a single pass around the ultraviolet tube. Therefore, a prior art reference such as Palestro that teachs multiple passes around the tube fully meets the claim limitation of "once around the ultraviolet band C radation tube". More specifically, a teaching of multiple passes around a tube includes the teaching of a single pass once around the tube. As such, claims 9-11 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as recited in the final rejection. Claims 3-5 and 7 also remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as indicated in the final rejection.